

**SCHUMANN | ROSENBERG**  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
3100 BRISTOL STREET, SUITE 400  
COSTA MESA, CALIFORNIA 92626-7333  
TELEPHONE (714) 850-0210

Kim Schumann, Esq., State Bar #170942  
Jeffrey P. Cunningham, Esq., State Bar #151067  
**SCHUMANN | ROSENBERG, LLP**  
3100 Bristol Street, Suite 400  
Costa Mesa, CA 92626  
Telephone (714) 850-0210  
Facsimile (714) 850-0551

Attorneys for Defendant, ORLY TAITZ

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SOUTHERN DIVISION**

LISA LIBERI, *et al.*

Plaintiffs,

vs.

ORLY TAITZ, *et al.*

Defendants.

) Case No. 8:11-CV-00485-AG (AJW)  
) Hon. Andrew Guilford  
) Courtroom 10D

**NOTICE OF FILING OF DECISION  
OF COURT OF APPEALS**

) Date Action Filed: May 4, 2009  
) Discovery Cut-Off: None  
) Final Pre-Trial Conf.: None  
) Trial Date: None

**TO THE COURT, ALL PARTIES, AND/OR THEIR ATTORNEYS OF  
RECORD:**

**NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN** that attached hereto as “**Exhibit A**” is a copy of the Decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in Case Nos. 11-56079 and 11-56164.

DATED: February 20, 2013

**SCHUMANN | ROSENBERG**

By: /s/ Jeffrey P. Cunningham  
Kim Schumann, Esq.  
Jeffrey P. Cunningham, Esq.  
Attorneys for Defendant,  
ORLY TAITZ

# EXHIBIT “A”

**FILED**

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

FEB 15 2013

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

LISA LIBERI; THE LAW OFFICES OF  
PHILIP J. BERG; PHILIP J. BERG,  
Esquire; LISA M. OSTELLA; GO EXCEL  
GLOBAL,

Plaintiffs - Appellees,

v.

DEFEND OUR FREEDOMS  
FOUNDATIONS, INC.,

Defendant - Appellant.,

\_\_\_\_\_,  
ORLY TAITZ, AKA Dr. Orly Taitz;  
SANKEY INVESTIGATIONS, INC.;  
NEIL SANKEY; LAW OFFICES OF  
ORLY TAITZ; ORLY TAITZ, INC.;  
REED ELSEVIER, INC.; TODD  
SANKEY; LEXISNEXIS GROUP, INC.,  
a Division of Reed Elsevier, Inc.;  
LEXISNEXIS, INC., a Division of Reed  
Elsevier, Inc.; LEXISNEXIS RISK AND  
INFORMATION ANALYTICS GROUP,  
INC.; LEXISNEXIS RISK SOLUTIONS,  
INC., a Division of Reed Elsevier, Inc.;

No. 11-56079

D.C. No. 8:11-cv-00485-AG-AJW

ORDER AND MEMORANDUM\*

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

LEXISNEXIS SEISINT, INC., a Division  
of Reed Elsevier, Inc., DBA Accurint;  
LEXISNEXIS CHOICEPOINT, INC., a  
Division of Reed Elsevier, Inc.;  
INTELIUS, INC.; ORACLE  
CORPORATION; DAYLIGHT  
CHEMICAL INFORMATION  
SYSTEMS, INC.; YOSEF TAITZ,  
Individually and as Owner/CEO of  
Daylight Chemical Information Systems,  
Inc.,

Defendants,

and

J. JOHNSON,

Movant.

LISA LIBERI; PHILIP J. BERG, Esquire;  
THE LAW OFFICES OF PHILIP J.  
BERG; LISA M. OSTELLA; GO EXCEL  
GLOBAL,

Plaintiffs - Appellees,

v.

ORLY TAITZ, AKA Dr. Orly Taitz,

Defendant - Appellant,

and

DEFEND OUR FREEDOMS  
FOUNDATIONS, INC.; SANKEY

No. 11-56164

D.C. No. 8:11-cv-00485-AG-AJW

INVESTIGATIONS, INC.; NEIL  
SANKEY; LAW OFFICES OF ORLY  
TAITZ; ORLY TAITZ, INC.; INTELIOUS,  
INC.; ORACLE CORPORATION; REED  
ELSEVIER, INC.; TODD SANKEY;  
LEXISNEXIS GROUP, INC., a Division  
of Reed Elsevier, Inc.; LEXISNEXIS,  
INC., a Division of Reed Elsevier, Inc.;  
LEXISNEXIS RISK AND  
INFORMATION ANALYTICS GROUP,  
INC.; LEXISNEXIS RISK SOLUTIONS,  
INC., a Division of Reed Elsevier, Inc.;  
LEXISNEXIS SEISINT, INC., a Division  
of Reed Elsevier, Inc., DBA Accurint;  
LEXISNEXIS CHOICEPOINT, INC., a  
Division of Reed Elsevier, Inc.;  
DAYLIGHT CHEMICAL  
INFORMATION SYSTEMS, INC.;  
YOSEF TAITZ, Individually and as  
Owner/CEO of Daylight Chemical  
Information Systems, Inc.,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Central District of California  
Andrew J. Guilford, District Judge, Presiding

Argued and Submitted February 6, 2013  
Pasadena, California

Before: O'SCANNLAIN, TROTT, and CLIFTON, Circuit Judges.

Orly Taitz and Defend Our Freedoms Foundations, Inc. (collectively  
“Defendants”) appeal the district court’s order denying their anti-SLAPP motion to

strike the original complaint brought against them by Lisa Liberi, Philip J. Berg, Lisa M. Ostella, the Law Offices of Philip J. Berg, and Go Excel Global (collectively “Plaintiffs”). We dismiss their appeal as moot.

Shortly after the district court denied Defendants’ anti-SLAPP motion to strike the original complaint, Plaintiffs filed their First Amended Complaint. Thus, the original complaint is no longer the operative complaint and is without legal effect—the First Amended Complaint has superseded it. *See Lacey v. Maricopa Cnty.*, 693 F.3d 896, 927 (9th Cir. 2012) (en banc) (recognizing “the general rule . . . that an amended complaint supercedes the original complaint and renders it without legal effect”). In light of the filing of the First Amended Complaint, Defendants’ appeal is moot. Even assuming we were to find error in the district court’s denial of Defendants’ anti-SLAPP motion to strike the original complaint, we could not grant any meaningful form of relief. Dismissal of the superseded original complaint would not alter the proceedings in the district court, as the parties would continue to litigate the merits of the claims contained in the now-operative First Amended Complaint. *See Grand Canyon Trust v. U.S. Bureau of Reclamation*, 691 F.3d 1008, 1016–17 (9th Cir. 2012) (“If an event occurs that prevents the court from granting effective relief, the claim is moot and must be

dismissed.” (quoting *Am. Rivers v. Nat’l Marine Fisheries Serv.*, 126 F.3d 1118, 1123 (9th Cir. 1997)).

Because this case became moot on appeal through the “unilateral action of the party who prevailed in the lower court”—namely, Plaintiffs’ filing of the First Amended Complaint—we vacate the decision of the district court. *See Arizonans for Official English v. Arizona*, 520 U.S. 43, 71 (1997) (quoting *U.S. Bancorp Mortg. Co. v. Bonner Mall P’ship*, 513 U.S. 18, 23 (1994)). The case is remanded to the district court for further proceedings.<sup>1</sup>

**DISMISSED.**

---

<sup>1</sup> We deny all outstanding motions filed by both parties. Although we do not grant either parties’ motions for sanctions, we nonetheless note that the parties in this case have persisted in treating the courts as a public spectacle in which they repeatedly manifest their personal dislike for one another without regard to the truth or appropriate decorum. As the district court aptly noted, “This case is roiled by in-fighting, petty history, and an apparent disregard for accuracy and fair play. Thus, the discernment of truth is a constant difficulty for the Court.” The parties should consider this fair warning: continued failure to abide by the rules of the court may result in sanctions.